

The problem with this bill, it bans procedures—and maybe all procedures—many procedures, except some that are very dangerous to a woman, and procedures that could be used at any stage of abortion. That is what the court said, and it makes no exception for her health. I argue the life exception is very narrowly drawn, but we don't have time to go into that tonight.

Thank you very much. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I reiterate the fact that this is not an issue that gets to the basis of the Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade*. I predict that just as in the past on the floor of the Senate, there are going to be people supporting the outlaw of this gruesome procedure, which is not necessary, who are very much pro-choice, pro-abortion, and who will probably have amendments on the floor of the Senate, a sense of the Senate, in terms of *Roe v. Wade* and many of the people who will vote to sustain *Roe v. Wade* will be some of the same people who will vote against this procedure because they understand how gruesome it is.

I point out one other fact. You just cannot give the back of the hand statistics from the Alan Guttmacher Institute, which is a very respected institute, which is an affiliate of Planned Parenthood, that published a survey of abortion providers showing—these are abortion providers, OK—showing that the number of partial-birth abortions more than tripled between 1996 and 2000.

So this procedure is not one that is being practiced in some of the examples that my colleague from California has presented on the floor of the Senate but, rather, has become a regular procedure in the offices of many OB/GYN doctors in this country—a procedure that is not necessary.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this much-needed and long-overdue measure. There is no place in a decent Nation for the barbaric practice known as partial-birth abortion. Senator SANTORUM's measure is the only one the Senate is considering that will put an end to it once and for all.

Every abortion ends the life of a tiny boy or girl, but only partial-birth abortion involves the destruction of life at the moment when a child is being brought out of the womb—and he or she is just inches from under the full protection of our laws. Partial-birth abortion blurs the line and does so in such a way as to further erode the sanctity of life.

The legislation Senator SANTORUM has proposed should avoid the constitutional problems that five Supreme Court Justices found in Nebraska's statute in the *Stenberg v. Carhart* case. Specifically, it addresses the concern that the partial-birth abortion

procedure might be necessary to protect the health of the mother by incorporating as findings the view of the American Medical Association and the overwhelming majority of physicians that there is no circumstance where the health of the mother demands this procedure. It also contains a more specific definition of the partial-birth abortion procedure, in response to the Stenberg decision.

This revised definition ensures that, once we pass this bill, it will no longer be permissible in America to—and here I quote the language of the bill itself—“deliberately and intentionally vaginally deliver a living fetus until, the entire fetal head is outside the body of the mother and then kill the baby as happens in a typical partial-birth abortion.”

There is no doubt, in contrast, that the substitute measures that the Senate is considering will permit the continued use of this unconscionable procedure. To secure the approval of the radical, pro-abortion lobby, the authors of such measures inevitably draft their so-called “bans” in such a way as to permit “health of the mother” exceptions that effectively negate the restrictions. Again, the testimony of the mainstream medical community makes it clear that “health of the mother” is a red herring in the partial-birth abortion context, and I trust that any measure containing such an “exception” will be soundly defeated.

It is simply not possible to seek cover politically while substantively protecting the most unscrupulous abortionists. The American people overwhelmingly favor enactment of a real partial-birth abortion ban. Despite the predictable efforts to obscure what is really a very clear issue—how we wish to treat the most vulnerable members of our human family—they will soon have it.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE PROSPECT OF WAR AGAINST IRAQ AND SUPPORTING OUR ARMED FORCES

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today to speak about some of the most crucial issues facing our Nation: No. 1, the prospect of war against Iraq, and, No. 2—though it will never be in second place—support for our U.S. military.

It has been my longstanding position to support a multinational response to the Iraqi threat. That means building international support to defang Saddam Hussein. We all know he is a duplicitous character, but I believe if the goals of America and the world are to be successful, we need to work in a

multilateral way, working through the United Nations, to build international legitimacy, and also to get the world to support us, to share the burden of war, if war is necessary, during the war in terms of the danger, and to share the burden of what would come after the war in terms of the economic cost of rebuilding Iraq.

The risks and consequences of acting alone are much greater than they would be for multinational action. The risks to our troops are greater. If allied forces do not join the mission, our troops will be bearing that burden all by themselves. The challenge in post-conflict Iraq will be greater if other nations do not share this responsibility or this burden. Also, I believe the consequences for the war on terrorism will be greater if we lose the essential cooperation of other nations.

There is a lot of disagreement about going to war: whether we should go to war now; whether we should go to war at all; whether we should go to war alone or whether we should continue to work through the United Nations. I have stated my own positions. But I believe there is something all Americans agree on; that is, we must support our troops. We must stand up for those who are standing up for us. We must protect our defenders, the brave men and women of our military, and we must support them not only with words but with deeds. That means ensuring that our troops have the best and smartest weapons, that they have the training and the equipment they need.

But while we are standing up for our military, we must also stand up for their families. Our troops will face grave danger. They should not have to face fear for their families, and particularly they should not have to worry about their families' finances.

Although America is on the brink of war, American military families must never be on the brink of bankruptcy. That is why we, in the Senate, must take immediate steps to support military families.

There is legislation pending. Let's provide tax relief to military families. Let's pass legislation to help the families of the National Guard and the Reserves who have been called up for longer periods than at any time in the past 40 years.

Each and every member of our military is part of the American family. Their service is a tremendous sacrifice and great risk. These are ordinary men and women called upon to act in an extraordinary way. Whatever their Nation asks them to do, I know they will do it with bravery, fortitude, and gallantry. All Americans owe them a debt of gratitude.

Members of the military, though, do not just need our gratitude through words; they need our gratitude through deeds. That is why I support two immediate steps and call upon the Senate to join with me and other like-minded colleagues to advance these steps.

I believe the Senate must quickly pass legislation to ease the tax burden

on our American military. Our troops should not have to worry about tax deadlines and paperwork when they are preparing to defend our Nation.

I urge the Senate to pass, this week, the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act, without loading it down with any special interest giveaways. While some are preoccupied with tax cuts for "Joe Millionaire," we should be preoccupied with GI Joe and GI Jane.

At the same time, we need to look at the financial burden many of the families are facing. Let's talk about the National Guard and the Reserves. The Senate also has to help the Guard and Reserves. They have been called up in record numbers. Right this minute, 168,000 Guard and Reservists are serving alongside our active-duty military.

Since September 11, over 230,000 of our National Guardsmen and Reservists have been mobilized. In my own home State of Maryland, that number is at least 4,000. And not only have they been called up, but many have been called up more than once over the past year and a half.

The Guard and Reserves are ready to serve. They are our citizen soldiers. They are called up in times of national emergency. Yet they are being asked to serve for longer periods of time. Many have been called up three or four times since September 11. This places a tremendous burden on their families. There are financial burdens of losing pay and losing businesses. Let me give you some examples from my own home State of Maryland.

The 115th Military Police Battalion of the Maryland Army National Guard has been deployed repeatedly since September 12, after the attack on the United States of America. That is when they were called up to stand guard at the Pentagon. When I went over to the Pentagon after the attack, I saw Maryland responding: I saw on the perimeters our own National Guard protecting the Pentagon, and Maryland first responders doing the rescue and recovery. When they were called up, they wanted to be there. Then they had a two-week breather. But then they were called up to guard the prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, and now they are deployed in Afghanistan.

The long periods of mobilization are hard not only on them but on their families. Let me give you some examples of what the families are facing.

I will talk about a reservist in Columbia, MD. He is a wonderful guy, and he owns a small home improvement business. After the terrible snows, this business would be booming, but he is not there to fix gutters or sidings, or help seniors repair those leaky basements. He has been called up most of the year. He has already been called up three times, and now he has been called up once again. He has been called up so often that he has had to shut down his home improvement business, where he was the sole employee. His family is now forced to borrow against their home to make ends meet. They have

already gone through their savings, and they have already gone through their children's tuition money for college. We have to think about this man and his family.

In a family in Centreville, the husband has been activated four times over the past year and a half. He is the main breadwinner. The family has already lost half of their income this year. They are having a difficult time making payments on their home and, in fact, the wife and children are now considering moving in with her parents.

Then there is the National Guardsman in St. Mary's County, who has been deployed 9 months out of the last 18 months. In February, he was deployed again. His wife is now working two jobs to make ends meet.

We have to face this challenge. For years we have faced the challenge of how we had been shortchanging our military. We have increased pay for full-time duty and we have improved benefits. We needed to do that and that was the right thing to do.

Now we are facing a unique challenge, looking at the Guard and the Reserves who are ready to do their duty, but they are now being deployed as frequently as if they were on active duty and their families are facing hardship.

As part of this response, I will be joining Senator DICK DURBIN to introduce legislation called the Reservists Pay Security Act of 2003. It would ensure that Federal employees who take leave to serve in our military reserves receive the same pay as if no interruption in their employment occurred. Why start with Federal employees? Well, many large companies and local governments continue to pay the full salary of their employees when they are activated. I applaud those excellent corporate citizens and those local governments. Some of the largest employers in my own State are also meeting that responsibility. The Federal Government should be a model employer and set the example for large businesses. This should be a first step.

I believe we should move quickly to pass this bill because many members of the Guard and Reserves do work for the Federal Government in highly specialized areas. But the Federal Government needs to do more than that. We need to take a look at those who work for small business and those who are self-employed. A call for duty will be responded to, but a call for duty time and time again in a single-year period places the responsibility on the family. American families should never subsidize our war effort. We should be looking out for those families.

Supporting our troops should be more than speeches, it should be more than parades. Sure, when the war begins—if it does begin—I believe there will be an outpouring of great American sympathy. But we need to put it into action to help the men and women defending our Nation; and for the full-time active duty, continue raising pay

and improving benefits; and for our Reserves and our Guardsmen, to close the gap between the income they are leaving behind and the country they are working to defend.

Please, let's pass that Tax Fairness Act. Our military should not even be paying taxes when they are at war in Iraq. There should be shared sacrifice in the United States of America, and that means not only shared sacrifice in terms of those who are willing to go and fight, but we need to fight for those who are fighting for us.

I urge my colleagues to join me in putting the men and women of our military at the top of our agenda, whether as we look at the issues facing the economy or facing taxes, because, remember, as our budget is strained, theirs is near the breaking point.

I conclude by saying God bless our troops and God bless America.

#### A DIPLOMATIC LOSS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a piece that appeared on the editorial pages of the Washington Post on Sunday. It was a letter of resignation from John Brady Kiesling, a career State Department diplomat who offered some very compelling thoughts about the state of our international relations.

After two decades with the State Department, Mr. Kiesling left his job on March 7 because he no longer believed the President's policies reflected the interests of the American people.

Mr. Kiesling wrote that in our pursuit of war with Iraq, the U.S. had squandered the legitimacy: that has been America's most potent weapon of both offense and defense since the days of Woodrow Wilson.

We have begun to dismantle the largest and most effective web of international relationships the world has ever known.

Mr. Kiesling wrote:

Our current course will bring instability and danger, not security.

But it was this thought that I found most compelling:

When our friends are afraid of us rather than for us, it is time to worry. And now they are afraid. Who will tell them convincingly that the United States is as it was, a beacon of liberty, security and justice for the planet?

This central question raised by Mr. Kiesling resonates with many Americans who feel frustrated and confused by the way the Bush Administration is performing on the international stage:

Why have we failed to persuade more of the world that a war with Iraq is necessary?

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kiesling's full letter of resignation, as it appears in yesterday's Washington Post, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DIPLOMAT'S GOODBYE

FEBRUARY 27, 2003

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you to submit my resignation from the Foreign